



In the United States Patent and Trademark Office

RECEIVED

AUG - 7 2002

TECHNOLOGY CENTER R3700

William E. McLaughlin

09/235,618

Filed 01/21/99

Group 3729

Asst Ex. Sean P. Smith, Supervisory Ex. Lee Young

Southampton, PA 18966-4545, May 18, 2001

FIRST Response to Final Rejection of April 10, 2001

Assistant Commissioner of Patents, Express mail and Box F.[FAX 703-308-7058 was not used in an effort to minimize burden on clerical staff for long amendment and to enhance clarity of pictures in Exhibits received by FAX]

Washington, DC 20231

Sir:

In response to the Final Rejection dated April 10, 2001, please cancel all pending claims, that is, claims 8-16 and substitute claim 17-23, which are submitted in both the "marked up" format and in the "clean format" so that they can be employed when one or more patents issue from this application.

Whenever any new terminology is employed after Final Rejection, applicant is expected to show the basis in the disclosure for such terminology. Applicant submits several "Exhibits" including Exhibit A which employs footnotes to clarify the new terminology of method claim 17. In accordance with the suggestion of the Examiner, Exhibit D is a "marked up" copy of 1 1/2 spaced specification [submitted about 01/11/01] having marks showing that the pertinent words of said claim 17 were in the specification. All of the Exhibits are between page 13 of the amendment and the signature page. Exhibits B [4pp] are data from the manufacturer of the LD-6000 Digitizer demonstrated to the Examiner. Exhibit C concerns CCDs which are light sensors useful in measuring the cumulative effect of a series of light pulses, such as used by Chadwell.

Certain segments of the Remarks merit particular emphasis, and have marginal lines for easy reference.

-1-

McLaughlin 10/015,798, Group 3813. Assistant Examiner A. Rade